(c) what is the number of drugs which were banned in India during the last three years ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI RASHEED MASOOD) : (a) and (b) Out of the 44 drugs reported by the WHO to be withdrawn in some countries, 26 drugs were not approved for marketing in India. While action to withdraw 11 drugs from the Indian market through various notifications has already been taken. The remaining 7 drugs namely (1) Nitrofuran Compounds, (ii) Phanformin (iii) Hydroxyquinoline derivative, (iv) Phenylbutazone/Oxyphenbutazone, (v) Higher dose Lynestrenol products, (vi) Piperazine and (vii) Analgin were allowed for continued marketing in the country in consultation wih the experts/ expert bodies, like Indian Council of Medical Research subject *to* a cautionary statement and contra-indication being given on the label/ package insert in some cases. While the drugs are reported to be withdrawn in some countries they continue to be marketed in a number of other countries including the developed ones. The reasons for withdrawal of the 7 drugs in some countries were examined by the experts : in many cases the reasons for withdrawal were either a toxic rinding in animals or an adverse reaction to a particular ethnic group. Considering the benefit and risk ratio of these drugs and considering the disease patterns that are prevalent in the country, the experts had recommended continued marketing of these drugs.

(c) During the last three years based on the data generated, the recommendation of the experts as well as in consultation with the Drugs Technical Advisory Board, and in exercise of the power under Section 26(A) of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, Govt through various notifications have banned three categories of formulation, viz.

(i) Fixed dose combination of Corticosteroids with any other drug for internal use.

(ii) Fixed dose combinations of Chloromphenicoi with any other drug for internal use.

(iii) Fixed dose combination of Oestrogen and Progestin (other than oral contraceptive).

**महाराष्ट्र में रुग्ण औद्योगिक एकक**

1260. **श्री विश्वासराव रामराव पाटिल** : क्या उद्योग मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) 31 दिसम्बर, 1989 की स्थिति के अनुसार महाराष्ट्र में बड़े, मध्यम और लघु औद्योगिक एककों की संख्या कितनी कितनी थी और उनमें कितने कितने मजदूर काम कर रहे थे ;

(ख) महाराष्ट्र में कुल कितने रुग्ण औद्योगिक एकक हैं और उनकी रुग्णता के क्या कारण हैं तथा उनके द्वारा कितने मजदूरों की छंटनी की गई थी ;

(ग) 1 जनवरी, 1989 से 31 दिसम्बर, 1989 के मध्य कितने औद्योगिक एकक बन्द किये गये और उसके क्या कारण थे ; और

(घ) ऐसे एककों में सरकार तथा बैंकों की कितनी धनराशि फंसी हुई है ?

**उद्योग मंत्री (श्री अजीत सिंह)** : (क) देश में बैंकों से सहायता प्राप्त रुग्ण औद्योगिक इकाइयों के आंकड़े भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक द्वारा एकत्रित किये जाते हैं । भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक द्वारा एकत्रित आंकड़ों में महाराष्ट्र में मौजूदा बड़े, मझौले तथा लघु औद्योगिक इकाइयों की कुल संख्या और उनमें नियुक्त किये गये कुल कर्मचारियों की संख्या नहीं

दर्शाई गई है । इसमें केवल रुग्ण औद्योगिक इकाइयों के बारे में सूचना है। तथापि, महाराष्ट्र सरकार से प्राप्त सूचना के अनुसार 31–12–1989 की स्थिति के अनुसार महाराष्ट्र राज्य में 1,70,217 पंजीकृत लघु औद्योगिक एकक थे और बड़े तथा मझौले क्षेत्र में 1,088 एकक थे।

(ख) और (घ) भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक से प्राप्त नवीनतम सूचना के अनुसार महाराष्ट्र में गैर-लघु औद्योगिक रुग्ण इकाइयों की संख्या 255 और लघु औद्योगिक रुग्ण इकाइयों की संख्या 15,959 थी और जून, 1988 के अन्त तक इनके नाम बकाया धनराशि क्रमश: 866.69 करोड़ रु. और 371.89 करोड़ रु. थी।

आंतरिक तथा बाह्य दोनों ही प्रकार के कई कारण देश में औद्योगिक रुग्णता के लिये जिम्मेदार है। इनमें से कुछ मुख्य कारण इस प्रकार हैं–गलत परियोजना नियोजन, प्रबंध संबंधी कमियां, अकुशल वित्तीय नियंत्रण, स्रोतों का दिशांतरण, अनुसंधान तथा विकास की ओर अपर्याप्त ध्यान, प्रौद्योगिकी, और मशीनरी का अप्रचलित होना, खराब औद्योगिक संबंध, बाजार मांग में परिवर्तन, अधिक लागत और कच्चे मालों की दुर्लभता, और अवस्थापनापरक बाधायें ।

(ग) भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक द्वारा एकत्रित आंकड़ों के बन्द पड़े रुग्ण इकाइयों की संख्या तथा छंटनी किये गये कर्मचारियों की संख्या नहीं होती है।

**Expansion of Neyveli Lignite Corporation**

1261. PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE : Will the Minister of ENERGY be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 747 given in the Rajya Sabha on 4th May, 1990 and state :

(a) whether it is a fact that MAN-GHH had no past experience for building up such huge Spreador Project and whether that forced the Technical Consultant to object to the firm's entry into the bid ;

(b) whether the firm had also failed to build up the Backet Wheel Excavator in time and again failed due to lack of technological acumen ; and

(c) what is the present state of Spreador Project ?

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. UPENDRA) : (a) Initially technical consultants had not recomm uded inclusion of MAN-GHH in the short-list of spreaders for Second Mine Expansion Project on the ground that they lacked adequate experience of manufacturing spreador. However, on the basis of range and variety of equipment supplied by MAN-GHH outside India as well as to NLC and the fact that the same consultant viz. M/s. Rheinbraun had qualified MAN-GHH for supply of sophisticated equipment like bucket wheel excavators, spreaders and mobile transfer conveyors for the Second Mine Stage-I, NLC decided to keep MAN-GHH in the short-list of tenderers for the two 20,000 tonnes per hour spreaders for the second mine expansion project to make the offer more competitive. This decision was also concurred in by the same Technical Consultant i.e. M/s. Rheinbraun and by KFW, West German Financing Agency.

(b) There was some delay in commissioning of the bucket wheel excavators by MAN-GHH in the Second Mine Stage-I due to problems in the process of indigenisation and proeur.m nt of critical materials and components and not due to lack of technological acumen. The bucket wheel excavators are now working satisfactorily. Similarly, the delay in commissioning of ths two spreaders for the secoad Mine ex-